



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/585,231  | 05/30/2000  | Sandeep Kishan Singhal | Boc9-1999-0086/1582P | 4912             |
| 7590  | 11/10/2004  |                        | EXAMINER             |                  |
| Joseph A Sawyer<br>Sawyer Law Group LLP<br>P O Box 51418<br>Palo Alto, CA 94303 |             |                        | NAJJAR, SALEH        |                  |
|   |             |                        | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                        | 2157                 |                  |

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/585,231

Applicant(s)

SINGHAL ET AL.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 51-58 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 51-58 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/06/04.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed August 6, 2004. Claims 1-30, and 51-58 are pending.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-30, and 51-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,363,419 in view of Goodman, U.S. Patent No. 5,999,929.

Martin teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method and apparatus for generating idle loop screen displays on mobile wireless devices (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Martin teaches a method for increasing ease-of-use and bandwidth utilization in a wireless device capable of accessing a communication network, comprising the steps of:

(a) maintaining content address identifiers that are categorized by environmental factors (see figs. 1-4; col. 11, lines 35-60, Martin discloses that content address identifiers are organized for targeting according to geographical location of the mobile device);

(b) receiving information by a network server about the wireless device's environment (see col. 11, lines 20-60, Martin discloses that handoff from one geographic location of the mobile device is reported to the server);

(c) querying the servers using the environment information to determine web sites most likely to be requested by a user of the wireless device in that environment (see col. 4, lines 1-60; col. 11, lines 1-50, Martin discloses that proxy server interrogates the content servers 110 or 112 for targeted content addresses related to the geographical position of the mobile device);

(d) pushing identifiers of the web sites identified to be most likely to be requested to the wireless device for selection by the user, wherein server policies determine which web site identifiers are sent to the device (see col. 4; col. 11, Martin discloses that proxy server broadcasts targeted content addresses related to the geographical position of the mobile device); and

(e) automatically pushing content from one or more of the identified web sites to the device in times when bandwidth is not in use to speed responsiveness of the device (see col. 9-11).

Martin fails to teach the limitation of maintaining a database of web site identifiers. Martin does teach that the proxy server retrieves targeted idle content identifiers based on the mobile device geographical position from content servers 110 and 112 (see figs. 1-4; col. 7-11).

However, Goodman teaches a URL link referral system and method for generating and classifying URL links (see abstract). Goodman teaches the claimed limitation of maintaining a database of web site identifiers (see figs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 1-10; col. 3, lines 1-60; col. 4, lines 20-65; col. 5, lines 20-67; col. 6, lines 5-15, Goodman discloses that an analyzer system analyzes and classifies URL links that are stored in link class database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Martin in view of Goodman to implement and maintain a database of classified web site identifiers. One would be motivated to do so that the most related links are transmitted to clients.

As to claim 2, Martin teaches the method of claim 1 further including the step of providing geographic location as the environment information (see col. 11, lines 15-60).

As to claim 4, Martin teaches the method of claim 1 further including the step of providing time and date as the environment information (see col. 11, lines 15-60).

As to claim 5, Martin discloses the method of claim 1 further including the step of personalizing which identifiers are pushed based on personalization information (see col. 12, lines 40-45).

As to claim 6, Martin teaches the method of claim 1 further including the step of providing URLs as the identifiers (see col. 10-11).

As to claim 7, Martin teaches the method of claim 1 further including the step of sending a location specific welcome page (LSWP) to the wireless device for display (see col. 7-11).

Claims 9-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-30, and 51-58 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-2, 4-7 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claims 3, 11, 19, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Goodman further in view of Hancock et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,202,023.

Martin teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method and apparatus for generating idle loop screen displays on mobile wireless devices (see abstract).

As to claim 3, Martin teaches the method of claim 1.

Martin fails to teach the limitation further including the step of providing local weather as the environment information. Martin does teach that current network conditions such as weather related information may be pushed to the mobile device (see col. 6).

However, Hancock teaches a Internet based geographic location referencing system and method (see abstract). Hancock teaches the step of providing local weather as the environment information (see col. 29, Hancock discloses that weather

Art Unit: 2157

conditions are reported to the server to provide more accurate predictions on what web site data is appropriate for the device).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Martin in view of Hancock so that weather is reported to the server to relate web sites for the environmental conditions where the client is available. One would be motivated to do so to provide more accurate predictions on web site data that is likely to be requested.

Claims 11, 19, and 28 do not teach or define any new limitations above claim 3 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

5. Claims 8, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Goodman and further in view of Giangarra et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,101,472.

Martin teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method and apparatus for generating idle loop screen displays on mobile wireless devices (see abstract).

As to claim 8, Martin teaches the method of claim 1.

Martin fails to teach the claimed limitation of pushing keyword URLs to the wireless device for speech recognition matching.

However, Giangarra teaches a system and method for navigating a network using voice command (see abstract). Giangarra teaches pushing keyword URLs to the wireless device for speech recognition matching (see col. 3-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Martin by providing access to links through voice commands as taught by Giangarra. One would be motivated to do so to provide simple speech command interface to a browser.

Claims 16, and 24 do not teach or define any new limitation above claim 8 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Art Unit: 2157

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30, and 51-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157